

## 500,000 IN TWELVE YEARS.

The World will celebrate its twelfth anniversary in a special edition to-morrow. This edition will emphasize many interesting facts and memories. It will especially mark an achievement never heard of before—the piling up of more than half a million circulation in twelve years.

The secret of this growth will be explained very carefully in to-morrow's edition for the benefit of all the editors of creation. The secret, briefly, is this: Make your paper independent, truthful, honest. Mix plenty of brains and persimmon with your good principles. Fight for the people and win your battles, and, in addition to all the good that you do, publish every day a newspaper that puts all others in the shade from the strictly newspaper point of view. Then you will get the kind of success that is yours.

Of course this anniversary number will be wonderfully and unusually bright. It will indulge to a magnificent extent in the pleasures of a triumphant reminiscence. But that is more important, it will prove its right to five hundred thousand more circulation by its evident independent superiority.

A man who has looked through the Sunday World supplements, as the writer of this advertisement is now under the seal of the gentlemen sent in to O'Connell, who did not dare on returning to tell of half the wonders they saw. This great and special number contains the usual wonderful array of Sunday World features, but everything is amplified and magnified as never before. The paper will contain five hundred columns. That means about a million words. To produce this supply the English language has been pulled all to pieces, and yet every word sparkles with truth and every column is as thoroughly as a milk bottle in its own right.

To try to read all of these five hundred columns however briefly would be hopeless. But if you want an idea of what you will get, read the following paragraphs concerning the special articles which will appear in a special supplement added to the regular paper.

W. R. Connelley has written an article which every lawyer, student of law and every other man of intelligence will want to read. "Our Greatest Lawyer" is his title.

Mrs. Parkhurst writes about the old-fashioned girl. She does not care for the free-and-easy manners of some girls of to-day.

William Travers Jerome writes about "The Mystery of an Heir," just an interesting and moving tale without any moral.

Hjalmar Horth Boyesen (leave off the H's and pronounce it like Y's and you're as in) writes about "The New York Novel." He thinks the great New York novel will be written by a bachelor in the country or by a married man rich enough to tell publishers what he thinks of them.

Mrs. Hattie Green, the ablest woman in the world from the practical standpoint and one of the most interesting, writes about finance. She will be read with attention and respect, for she carries two, or three million dollars down town in her arms one day and has twenty or thirty millions in the bank the next.

Mr. G. P. Morosini writes about the late Jay Gould and finds a lot to admire in that man. He tells new stories about him. All the Castellans should read this and learn to take a cheerful view of their dead relative.

Miss Jeannette L. Gilder writes about the new woman in fiction and about single happiness. She knows more about both topics than any other woman in the world. A woman can be happy though unmarried, if she has sense.

A wonderful collection of great humorists write about their trade. They all take their business seriously, which is right, and they do not take themselves too seriously, which is right also. Mark Twain, Opper, Gilliam, Zim, Dairymple, Howarth and Tom Mason are among the humorous artists and writers each of whom has devoted his highest talents to a special feature for to-morrow's Sunday World.

These comic and great writers have ability and they prove it. It is a thousand pities that they are not all engaged in some serious, regular, reputable business such as Journalism.

A series of five serious articles by five clergymen will attract and hold many readers.

Seven distinguished politicians write about their political views and ambitions. Mr. Franklin Bartlett, who combines literature and law, cottons and Congress, puts his views into seven lines. That is an achievement for many to emulate.

This one supplement of the Sunday World contains fifty-eight separate articles, every one written by a man or woman of wide reputation and by one writing with highest authority on the subject treated.

It is needless to ask whether you have heard of such a collection of articles by great authorities being published in one edition of a newspaper, for you never did, and you know it.

If those who buy The World should wish to go to church at the same time it would take a crowd of thousands coming from the Battery to Kingsbridge, on both sides of the street, to hold them. Think of that for a crowd. You belong to the greatest and grandest congregation on earth as a World reader. If you know any bettered person who does not read this, the only thing to do is to make him buy to-morrow's edition as a sample and he will always be your friend.

Summer Bouts Getting Ready.

The steamer Grand Republic will make her first trip up the Hudson Sunday, May 12, to Newburg, West Point and Yonkers. Capt. John Pease has been her captain for the last five years.

The Gen. Republic and Grand Republic, the two best steamers in the world, will be in the harbor on Sunday, May 12, to New York.

Mr. Greenham's Condition Unchanged.

## MISS FRYATT'S CAT.

Prof. Yeaton's Dog Killed the Pet and There Was Trouble.

Wrote Her He Could Not Receive Letters from Bachelor Males.

Now He Must Answer for Violating the United States Mail Law.

United States Commissioner Benedict, in Brooklyn, this morning, arraigned for examination Prof. Moses Yeaton, of West Brooklyn, charged with sending libelous mail matter to Miss Frances Fryatt, who lives opposite his place of residence.

Prof. Yeaton is a deacon in the Greenwood Baptist Church, South Brooklyn, and teaches the graduating class in Public School No. 34. He is married. Miss Fryatt is an editor and authoress of some reputation.

Some time ago Prof. Yeaton's dog strayed into Miss Fryatt's yard and killed her pet cat. She wrote a letter to the professor, asking him to chain up the dog. When Prof. Yeaton received the letter he refused to open it, and wrote across the back of the envelope: "I am a married man and cannot receive letters from a bachelor maid."

The only witnesses this morning were Miss Beatrice Noe, the pretty postmistress of West Brooklyn, and the professor.

Miss Fryatt was not in court. Miss Noe testified that she saw Prof. Yeaton write on the back of the envelope, and told her to send it back to Miss Fryatt.

This part of Miss Noe's testimony is what the prosecution has its case on. Prof. Yeaton came to court accompanied by Principal Moore, of the Normal avenue school. He said the case was not worth employing counsel to defend.

When District Attorney Bennett began the prosecution the professor changed his mind and demanded counsel.

He was able to do so in case of conviction he was liable to a fine of \$500 and five years imprisonment.

Miss Fryatt was not in court. Miss Noe testified that she saw Prof. Yeaton write on the back of the envelope, and told her to send it back to Miss Fryatt.

Prof. Yeaton came to court accompanied by Principal Moore, of the Normal avenue school. He said the case was not worth employing counsel to defend.

When District Attorney Bennett began the prosecution the professor changed his mind and demanded counsel.

He was able to do so in case of conviction he was liable to a fine of \$500 and five years imprisonment.

Miss Fryatt was not in court. Miss Noe testified that she saw Prof. Yeaton write on the back of the envelope, and told her to send it back to Miss Fryatt.

Prof. Yeaton came to court accompanied by Principal Moore, of the Normal avenue school. He said the case was not worth employing counsel to defend.

When District Attorney Bennett began the prosecution the professor changed his mind and demanded counsel.

He was able to do so in case of conviction he was liable to a fine of \$500 and five years imprisonment.

Miss Fryatt was not in court. Miss Noe testified that she saw Prof. Yeaton write on the back of the envelope, and told her to send it back to Miss Fryatt.

Prof. Yeaton came to court accompanied by Principal Moore, of the Normal avenue school. He said the case was not worth employing counsel to defend.

When District Attorney Bennett began the prosecution the professor changed his mind and demanded counsel.

He was able to do so in case of conviction he was liable to a fine of \$500 and five years imprisonment.

Miss Fryatt was not in court. Miss Noe testified that she saw Prof. Yeaton write on the back of the envelope, and told her to send it back to Miss Fryatt.

Prof. Yeaton came to court accompanied by Principal Moore, of the Normal avenue school. He said the case was not worth employing counsel to defend.

When District Attorney Bennett began the prosecution the professor changed his mind and demanded counsel.

He was able to do so in case of conviction he was liable to a fine of \$500 and five years imprisonment.

Miss Fryatt was not in court. Miss Noe testified that she saw Prof. Yeaton write on the back of the envelope, and told her to send it back to Miss Fryatt.

Prof. Yeaton came to court accompanied by Principal Moore, of the Normal avenue school. He said the case was not worth employing counsel to defend.

When District Attorney Bennett began the prosecution the professor changed his mind and demanded counsel.

## COUNT NOT HIT THIS MAD DOG.

The Brute Defied Policemen's Bullets and Clubs All Night Long.

HE CLEANED OUT A SALOON.

Then He Terrorized the Neighborhood of Forty-Second Street and Third Avenue.

Policemen Say There Were Two Dogs, and Are Grieved for Poor Marksmanship.

It took eleven bullets from a policeman's revolver and a large amount of clubbing to kill a dog that went mad at Forty-second street and Third Avenue last night.

The shot was fired about the same time, either. Four of them were fired after the dog had terrorized the neighborhood for a time, and incidentally had cleaned out a saloon.

"Two of the bullets took effect, and the animal died," said a policeman.

But when the crowd had disappeared he was actually killed, after his head had been shot away.

It was about 11:30 last night when the dog, a great big black and white mongrel, was seen running down Forty-second street. Just as it reached Connor's saloon on the corner the animal lay down at the edge of the sidewalk.

Its tongue was rolling and its mouth was coated with froth.

At that hour there were children about, and they began crowding about the spot.

The effect was electrical.

With a yell the dog sprang to his feet and dashed into the saloon, in which were a number of customers.

The cry of "mad dog" did more to clear out the place than anything else.

The animal kept barking and snapping at the customers.

Then the animal turned into Third avenue, and ran down the cellar steps.

The doors were fastened, however, and it was while the dog was crouching on the floor of the saloon that he was shot.

The dog was shot with a revolver and fired four shots. The dog was then apparently dead.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

On this basis, if the thirty dogs were equally divided between the eight and twelve cent dogs, the owner would be able to make out a profit of \$2.50 a week.

## 8 CENTS PER DOZEN.

Newman's Liberal Pay to His Kneepants Makers.

Sweat Shop Committee is After Contractor Rosenwasser.

Advocates of the New Mercantile Bill Heard.

The Reinhardt Assembly Investigating Committee, appointed to probe into the evils of the sweat shop system in this city, resumed its taking of testimony today in the Chamber of the Board of Aldermen.

Among the witnesses in attendance at the opening of the hearing was Henry D. Brewster, of Brokaw Bros., by whom it is said, the Committee will endeavor to impeach the testimony given by A. Rosenwasser, of 29 Stanton street, at a former hearing, as to the prices he received for work from the clothing manufacturers, which he offered as an excuse for not paying more wages to the women and girls employed by him.

It was reported that since testifying before the Committee, Rosenwasser had moved to New Jersey.

At 1:30 o'clock Chairman Reinhardt announced that he would hear testimony from the Committee members.

Mrs. Charles Russell Lowell, President of the Consumers' League, contended that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

Mrs. Lowell said that the Committee should have kept to the point of the hearing, and not have introduced the matter of the bill, which provides for putting stools where girls and women are employed, under the jurisdiction of the State Factory Inspectors.

## DOES JACKSON FAVOR IT?

Straws Which Show that He May Uphold the Income Tax.

The Nine Justices Hold a Consultation at the Capitol.

WASHINGTON, May 11.—The nine Justices of the United States Supreme Court held a consultation at the Capitol today from 11 until 12 o'clock, and there is every reason to believe that the result of the consultation was to reach a conclusion on the income tax question.

It is presumed that the usual custom of the court will be followed, and that to one of the justices in the majority has been assigned the work of preparing the opinion of the Court. The justices in the minority may each write a separate dissent or not as each individual prefers.

The consultations are held in secret, and no announcement of the conclusion reached is ever made prior to promulgation from the bench, but some circumstances connected with the session rather point to the vote of Justice Jackson having been cast in favor of the constitutionality of the law.

The principle reason for this statement is to be found in the fact that after the consultation of all the members of the court a private conference was held between Justices White, Harlan and Brown, who were all in favor of the law.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.

Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing, and Justice Jackson, who was not present, was not present at the previous hearing.